

## REMARKS

### 103 REJECTIONS

The present Office Action indicates Claims 1 – 9, 11-13, 15-19, 21 and 23 -32 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sudo et al. (US Patent No. 5,999,827). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claim 1, is neither shown nor suggested by the Sudo et al. reference. Specifically the present invention, as set forth in each and every newly amended independent Claim, recites:

... a jog dial for accessing and activating one of said applications, said jog dial coupled to said data bus.

The present Office Action acknowledges that the Sudo et al. reference fails to teach a display, central processor, RAM, ROM and jog dial coupled to a data bus. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Sudo et al. reference does not teach a jog dial for accessing and activating one of said applications.

The present Office Action indicates that “the claim is directed to a personal digital assistant jog dial application access and not to a personal assistant device, which means that the jog dial is the personal assistant”. The present Office Action appears to be indicating that the jog dial comprises the elements listed in the claim. Applicant respectfully asserts a jog dial is just one element of Claim 1 and that the jog dial element by itself is not the personal digital assistant jog dial application access and activation

system. For example, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 of the present application is directed to a personal digital assistant jog dial application access and activation system which comprises the elements of a data bus, a display , a central processor, a random access memory, a read only memory and a jog dial. The present Office Action also indicates the portable telephone of Sudo can be used as a personal digital assistant. Applicant respectfully asserts the Sudo reference does not teach or mention using the telephone as a personal digital assistant.

The present Office Action indicates that Sudo teaches a jog dial(4) for accessing and activating one of the applications (Col. 7 lines 17-30 and Col. 10 lines 45-53). Applicant respectfully asserts that to the extent the Sudo reference may mention a display driving circuit 35A to display information corresponding to instruction input from the operation keys, Applicant respectfully asserts the Sudo reference does not teach accessing and activating one of said applications. Applicant respectfully asserts that to the extent Sudo et al reference may teach displaying information concerning a selected item on a screen and start calling [Col. 10 lines 45 to 52 and Col. 11 lines 50 to 58] it does not teach accessing and activating one of a plurality of applications. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Sudo et al reference teaches away from the present invention by indicating a single function of calling is automatically initiated [Col. 10 lines 45 -50] and not a selection, access and activation of one of a plurality of applications. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the present jog dial for accessing and activating one of said applications as recited in the claims is neither shown nor suggested by the Sudo reference.

The present Office Action indicates that Claims 11, 21 and 28 are similarly rejected for reasons substantially similar to the reasons for rejecting Claim 1. In accordance with arguments presented in the previous Office Action, Applicant respectfully asserts the Sudo reference does to teach the invention as recited in Claims 11, 21 and 18. In addition, to the extent that Claims 11, 21 and 28 are similar to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the invention as recited in Claims 11, 21 and 28 are not taught by the Sudo reference for the reasons presented above.

Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-27 and 29- 31 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 6/7, 2004



John F. Ryan  
Reg. No. 47,050  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060